



**HON. SYLVIA O. HINDS-RADIX**  
*Corporation Counsel*

**THE CITY OF NEW YORK  
 LAW DEPARTMENT**  
 100 CHURCH STREET  
 NEW YORK, NY 10007

**EVAN J. GOTTMAN**  
*Assistant Corporation Counsel*  
 (212) 356-2262  
 egottste@law.nyc.gov

December 21, 2023

**By ECF**

Honorable Lorna G. Schofield  
 United States District Court  
 Southern District of New York  
 40 Foley Square  
 New York, New York 10007

Re: Ali Moore v. City of New York, et al.  
 22-CV-10957 (LGS)

Your Honor:

I am an Assistant Corporation Counsel in the Office of the Honorable Sylvia O. Hinds-Radix, Corporation Counsel of the City of New York, and the attorney for defendant the City of New York, David Castro, Nilsa Nivar (formerly Nilsa Patricio), Sanjay Bajnauth, Antonio Castelluccio, David Maldonado, and Kevin Rosas (hereinafter “City Defendants”) in the above-referenced action. City Defendants write pursuant to the Court’s December 11, 2023 Order to provide an update on the status of representation for Defendants Rosas and “Police Officer 718.” *See* ECF No. 121.

This Office now represents Defendant Rosas, and Defendant Rosas joins in City Defendants’ motion to dismiss that was filed on November 8, 2023, and was fully briefed as of December 20, 2023. *See* ECF No. 123.

The Court’s December 11, 2023 Memo Endorsement also ordered City Defendants to provide an update on the status of representation for “Police Officer 718.” The Court has not entered an Order to identify “Police Officer 718” pursuant to *Valentin v. Dinkins*, 121 F.3d 72, 76 (2d Cir. 1997), and, upon information and belief, the police officer with shield number 718 in October 2021 was assigned to the 109<sup>th</sup> Precinct in Queens and thus would not conceivably have been involved in either of the incidents at issue in this action. However, there is a *Sergeant*, Joseph Angelone, with shield number 718 who was assigned to the 26<sup>th</sup> Precinct at the time of the incidents at issue in this case.

Assuming Sergeant Angelone is the individual whom plaintiff seeks to sue as “Police Officer 718” in this action, which he has not affirmatively indicated, this Office still cannot represent this individual or move on behalf of Sergeant Angelone because he has not been properly named or served with process in this matter.

City Defendants also note that “Police Officer 718” appears *only* in the case caption and not anywhere in the 4AC’s sections titled “The Parties,” “Factual Allegations,” or in the 14-plus listed causes of action. Consequently, amending the complaint to add Sergeant Angelone would be futile, because the 4AC fails to allege any individualized actions on the part of this individual that would put them on fair notice of the nature of the claims against them. *See* City Def. Mem. in Support of Mot. to Dismiss, Point I, ECF No. 102. For this reason, the Court can sua sponte dismiss the case against “Police Officer 718.”

Plaintiff also should not be permitted to file yet another amended complaint naming Sergeant Angelone as a defendant because plaintiff has already amended his complaint *four times* in this case and has failed each time to allege enough facts to adequately state a claim against this individual. *See, e.g., Melvin v. Cty. of Westchester*, No. 14-CV-2995 (KMK), 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 41120, at \*80 n.19 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 29, 2016) (granting motion to dismiss with prejudice because the plaintiff “already had two bites at the apple, and they have proven fruitless”).

We thank the Court for its time and consideration of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Evan J. Gottstein /s/  
Evan J. Gottstein  
Assistant Corporation Counsel  
Special Federal Litigation Division

cc: Via First Class Mail  
Ali Moore  
*Plaintiff Pro Se*  
2506 East Overland Avenue  
Baltimore, Maryland 21214

Via ECF  
Eldar Mayouhas, Esq.  
*Attorney for NYCH+H Defendants*  
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith, LLP  
77 Water Street  
New York, New York 10005